REMARKS:

Claims 1-8 were pending in the subject application. Of these claims 3 and 4 were withdrawn. By this amendment, applicant has amended claims 1, 2, 5, 6, 7, and 8 and have canceled claims 3 and 4. No issue of new matter is raised by these amendments. Applicant respectfully request that the Examiner enter and consider these amendments. Upon entry of this Amendment, claims 1, 2, 5, 6, 7 and 8 as amended will be pending and under examination.

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 2, and 5-8 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as indefinite for certain translation and grammatical errors. The Examiner also rejected claims 1, 2, and 6-8 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by Lee, U.S. 2003/0177606 ("Lee"), and claim 5 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Lee in view of Park, U.S. 2004/0250377 ("Park").

In response, applicant maintains that the amendments made herein and the arguments herein below overcome these rejections.

Regarding Claim 1 of the present application, Lee does not disclose that a valve body moves forwardly to go into an operating chamber when pressure is received from a fluid flowing into the valve chamber. The valve body (115 or 20) described in Lee does not move forwardly to go into the operating chamber by receiving pressure of a fluid flowing into the valve chamber. See Figs. 2 and 4 of Lee. Lee also fails to disclose that a flow rate of the fluid passing through the flow path becomes smaller according to a movement of the valve body forwardly from its natural state position in the operating chamber. The flow rate of the fluid passing through the flow path described in Lee does not become smaller according to a movement of the valve body (115 or 20) forwardly from its natural state position in the operating chamber. See Figs. 2 and 4 of Lee.

In contrast, a valve mechanism described in Claim 1 of the present application comprises a valve body (8), which moves forwardly to go into an operating chamber (7) when pressure is received from a fluid flowing into a valve chamber (11). See paragraph [0039] in the specification and Fig. 9 of the present application.

In addition, the valve mechanism described in Claim 1 of the present application is so configured that a flow rate of the fluid passing through a flow path (14) becomes smaller according to a movement of the valve body (8) forwardly from its natural state position in the operating chamber (7). See paragraph [0040] in the specification and Fig. 10 of the present application.

Accordingly, a rotary damper described in amended Claim 1 of the present application or its dependent claims, is neither shown nor suggested by Lee.

Regarding Claim 5 of the present application, Park (US 2004/0250377 A1), as well as Lee, does not disclose that a valve body moves forwardly to go into an operating chamber when pressure is received from a fluid flowing into the valve chamber. The valve body (151) described in Park does not move forwardly to go into the operating chamber (160) by receiving pressure of a fluid. See Fig. 2 of Park. Park also does not disclose that a flow rate of the fluid passing through the flow path becomes smaller according to a movement of the valve body forwardly from its natural state position in the operating chamber. The flow rate of the fluid passing through the flow path (153a and 153b) described in Park does not become smaller according to a movement of the valve body (151) forwardly from its natural state position in the operating chamber (160). See Figs. 2 and 5B of Park.

Accordingly, a rotary damper described in Claim 5 of the present application is neither shown nor suggested by Lee and Park.

Respectfully submitted,

September 20, 2010

Aude Gerspacher
Registration No. 57,919

Cozen O'Connor
250 Park Avenue
New York, New York 10177-0030
Telephone: 212.986.1116